

EXHIBIT “6”

F (212) 490-6070

Tide Mill Landing, 2425 Post Road, Ste 302, Southport, CT 06890

P (203) 256-8600

F (203) 256-8615

**** NOTICE *** This message is being sent by a lawyer. It may contain attorney-client or attorney work product information subject to legal privilege. If you receive this message in error, please notify the sender. Thank you.*

From: GUTOWSKI, PETER [mailto:GUTOWSKI@FREEHILL.COM]

Sent: Wednesday, February 06, 2008 1:42 PM

To: Patrick F. Lennon

Subject: Ocean Victory

Dear Pat,

Thank you for your email yesterday which has been passed on to our UK solicitors. Our response follows.

Given the long history and prior exchanges between the parties, I am not sure if there is any real benefit in my responding on an individual basis to the points you raise, as I think we have made our position as clear as we can. At the risk of re-stating that position once again, let me just note the following:

(i) there is no obligation on the part of the plaintiff to accept security other than as is required by the rules and the case authority interpreting those rules;

(ii) we have been and we remain willing to consider reasonable substitute security; and,

(iii) if you would like to offer such security, please send us the language you propose for the single Skuld LOU or single first class bank Guaranty that you are offering, the terms of the side agreement (again we would propose using Ince's concise wording) and the other information regarding the authority to issue the Guaranty. If you are not offering a single instrument, please confirm.

As an aside, I note that Sinochart's sub-charterer Daiichi has now posted security in favor of Sinochart in the form of a single bank guaranty from the Mitsui Sumitomo Bank. To the extent your client is now fully secured "down the chain" so to speak, does it really make sense for us to continue to fight on all these peripheral issues, including the one present before Judge Chin (which is proving to be very expensive for both clients) as well as the issue of the form substitute security might take? On this last point, I simply do not understand why Sinochart does not provide the wording for what it is proposing, so we can consider it with our clients, and instead is engaging in a pre-negotiation negotiation which, to be absolutely blunt, seems a bit more designed to create a platform from which to launch an argument in Court to counter our request to amend the process than it is to resolve the security issue.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

PLEASE NOTE: The information contained in this message is privileged and confidential, and is intended only for the use of the individual named above and others who have been specifically authorized to receive such. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this communication in error, or if any problems occur with transmission, please notify us immediately by telephone - (212) 425-1900. Thank you.

5/12/2008